

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	Case No. 1:20-cr-00561-DAR-15
)	
Plaintiff,)	JUDGE DAVID A. RUIZ
)	
v.)	ORDER RE: SUPERVISED
)	RELEASE VIOLATION HEARING
TIFFANY BOGGS,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

This matter was before this Court for hearing on May 1, 2025, upon request of the probation office for a finding that the Defendant violated the conditions of supervised release. The Defendant was present and represented by Assistant Federal Public Defender Christian J. Grostic. Assistant U.S. Attorney Robert Corts present on behalf of the Government. U.S. Probation Officer Katelyn Keck was present on behalf of U.S. Pretrial Services and Probation.

Petitions were presented for action of the Court for cause as referenced in the March 28, 2025 Superseding Violation Report. Previously, Defendant appeared for a Supervised Release Violation hearing held by Magistrate Judge James E. Grimes, Jr. on April 4, 2025, at which time the Defendant knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily admitted to the four alleged supervised release violations: 1) Failure to Comply with Substance Use Treatment, 2) Illicit Drug Use, 3) Failure to Comply with Probation Officer Instructions, and 4) Whereabouts Unknown. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation on April 4, 2025, recommending *inter alia*

that the Court find Defendant knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily admitted to the above four violations.

During the hearing, the Court heard from counsel and Ms. Boggs, found good cause to adopt the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, and as explained on the record concluded that the Defendant committed the four violations of the terms and conditions of supervised release, which included, *inter alia*, falsifying drug screens to evade positive results, failing to comply with the conditions of treatment programs and supportive housing resulting in her unsuccessful discharge, failing to comply with outpatient treatment requirements, and her flight from the U.S. Pretrial Services and Probation Office when advised of a pending arrest warrant--all creating a risk to herself and the community. For the reasons explained on the record, the Court revoked supervised release after considering the parties' positions, the record, the pertinent standards set forth in 18 U.S.C. §3583e, and the Advisory Sentencing Guidelines and Policy Statements in Chapter 7. The Court sentenced the Defendant to 6 months custody of the Bureau of Prisons with credit for time served since her arrest for supervised release violations in this matter, followed by a term of 3 years supervised release. The Court ordered all previously ordered mandatory, standard and special conditions of supervised release remain in effect, and the Court ordered the additional condition of mental health medications if prescribed by Defendant's treating provider.

The Court advised Defendant of her appeal rights and remanded her to custody of the U.S. Marshal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: May 13, 2025

/s/ David A. Ruiz

David A. Ruiz

United States District Judge